

Appl. No. 10/695,958
In re ALLMANDINGER et al.
Reply to Office Action of Apr. 19, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the Official Action dated April 19, 2005. This amendment and request for reconsideration is intended to be fully responsive thereto.

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Otaki et al. (USPN 6,328,667) in view of Lansdale (USPN 5,013,050).

Claims 7-9 and 18 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 1. The Examiner, however, noted that claims 7-9 and 18 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Otaki in view of Lansdale. However, in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application claim 1 has been amended to include all the limitation of claim 7, thus placing it in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added. Claim 7 has been canceled. Claims 8 and 9 have been amended to change the dependency of claims 8 and 9 from canceled claim 7 to amended claim 1.


Moreover, new claims 20-30 have been added. The independent claim 20 corresponds to claim 1 including all the limitations of claim 18 indicated by the Examiner as allowable.

Appl. No. 10/695,958
In re ALLMANDINGER et al.
Reply to Office Action of Apr. 19, 2005

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-6, 8, 9, 18 and 20-30 define the invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe further discussion regarding the above claim language would expedite prosecution they are invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted:
Berenato, White & Stavish

By:



George Ayvazov

Reg. N° 37,483

6550 Rock Spring Drive, Suite 240
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
Tel. (301) 896-0600
Fax (301) 896-0607